

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.D. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
prww.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/002,049	11/02/2001	Charles F. Malone	KPF / 54	4375	
26875	7590 04/15/2004		EXAMINER		
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP 2700 CAREW TOWER 441 VINE STREET			LUGO, C	LUGO, CARLOS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CINCINNATI	, OH 45202		3677		
			DATE MAILED: 04/15/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
7	10/002,049	MALONE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Carlos Lugo	3677				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address X				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 No	ovember 2003.					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allower	<del>-</del>					
Disposition of Claims						
4)  Claim(s) 7-17 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 7-9,11 and 13 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) 10,12,14,15,16 is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers  9)  The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)  The drawing(s) filed on 02 November 2001 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the second content of the second	vn from consideration. r election requirement. r. re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat ity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)		·				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D  5) Notice of Informal F  6) Other:					

Art Unit: 3677

Page 2

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office Action is in response to applicant's appeal brief filed on November 17,
 2003.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 7-9,11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat No 5,419,305 to Hanley.

Regarding claim 7, Hanley discloses an oven door locking mechanism comprising a clutch mechanism. The clutch mechanism comprises a thermally responsive element (70), a clutch (the engaging portion at the end of the lock member 78), and a lock member (78).

A first spring (96) is in contact with the lock member (Figure 2). The lock member defines a first side of the clutch as a keyed aperture (Figure 4) that is engaged to the thermally responsive element.

The oven door locking mechanism locks and unlocks the oven door at substantially different temperatures.

As to claim 8, Hanley discloses that the keyed aperture comprises an annular recess (Figure 4).

Art Unit: 3677

As to claim 9, Hanley discloses that the lock member has a first end and a second end and the keyed aperture is defined at the first end.

As to claim 11, Hanley illustrates that the first spring encompasses the locking member (Figure 2).

As to claim 13, Hanley discloses that the oven door locking mechanism further comprises a latch mechanism (10,30,38 and 54) defining a lock hole (at the middle of 54) adapted to receive the lock member, and a mounting bracket (2) wherein the first spring is affixed to it (Figures 1 and 2).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 7-9,11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 6,474,702 to Malone et al (Malone) in view of US Pat No 3,540,767 to Siegel and further in view of US Pat No US Pat No 5,419,305 to Hanley.

Regarding claim 7, Malone discloses an oven door locking mechanism comprising a clutch mechanism. The clutch mechanism comprises a thermally responsive element (66), a clutch (the engaging portion 76 at the end of the lock member 72), and a lock member (72). The oven door locking mechanism locks and unlocks the oven door at substantially different temperatures.

Art Unit: 3677

However, Malone fails to disclose that the oven door locking mechanism comprises a first spring in contact with the lock member and that the lock member defines a first side of the clutch with a keyed aperture that is engaged to the thermally responsive element.

As to the fist spring, Hanley teaches that is known in the art to have a first spring (96) in contact with a lock member (Figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a spring in contact with the lock member, as taught by Hanley, into a device as described by Malone, in order to exert restraining pressure on the lock member.

As to the lock member defining a first side of the clutch with a keyed aperture that is engaged to the thermally responsive element, Malone discloses that the clutch (at 76) has a protrusion that is engaged to the thermally responsive element (Figure 4).

Siegel teaches that is known in the art to have a lock member (52) defining a first side of clutch with a keyed aperture (at an end of the lock member) that is engaged to a thermally responsive element (46). Furthermore, Hanley also illustrates this limitation (see 102 rejection above).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a keyed aperture, as taught by Siegel, into a device as described by Malone, in order to engage the clutch to the thermally responsive element.

Art Unit: 3677

As to claim 8, Siegel teaches that the keyed aperture comprises an annular recess (Figure 4).

As to claim 9, Siegel teaches that the lock member has a first end and a second end and the keyed aperture is defined at the first end (Figure 4).

As to claim 11, Hanley teaches that the first spring encompasses the locking member (Figure 2).

As to claim 13, Malone discloses that the oven door locking mechanism further comprises a latch mechanism (20 and 102) defining a lock hole (48) adapted to receive the lock member, and a mounting bracket (26).

Hanley teaches that the first spring (96) is affixed to the mounting bracket (2 at Figures 1 and 2).

#### Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 10 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 12,14 and 16 will also be allowed because the claims depend from claims 10 and 15 respectively.

#### Reasons For Allowable Subject Matter

7. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowable Subject Matter:

Claims 10 and 15 present allowable subject matter over the prior art of record because the teachings of the references taken as a whole do not teach or render obvious the combination set forth, including that the thermally responsive element

Art Unit: 3677

defines a slot that is in engagement with the keyed aperture (claim 10) and that the lock hole comprises a receiver member (claim 15).

Hanley (US 5,419,305) fails to disclose that the thermally responsive element (70) defines a slot that is in engagement with the keyed aperture. Hanley discloses that the thermally responsive element (70) defines a tab that is in engagement with the keyed aperture.

Malone (US 6,474,702) fails to disclose that the lock hole comprises a receiver member. Malone illustrates that the lock member just passes through the lock hole; no receiver member is placed into the hole (Figure 4).

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

### Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments, see Appeal Brief, filed on November 17, 2003, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim(s) 7-17 under 102(b) over Siegel (US 3,540,767) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hanley (US 5,419,305) and in view of Malone (US 6,474,702), as modified by Siegel (US 3,540,767) and Hanley (US 5,419,305).

Application/Control Number: 10/002,049 Page 7

Art Unit: 3677

#### Conclusion

 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlos Lugo whose telephone number is 703-305-9747. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-6pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Swann can be reached on 703-306-4115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-5771.

Carlos Lugo Examiner Art Unit 3677

April 7, 2004.

ROBÉRT J. SANDY PRIMARY EXAMINER